

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims Objections

Examiner has objected to claims 16, 18, 20, 28-30, 48, 50, 52, 60-62, 80, 82, 84 and 92-94, but has indicated same will be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of the base and intervening claims.

Applicant has rewritten claim 16 into base claim 1 to include all the intervening claim limitations.

Applicant has rewritten claim 48 into base claim 33 to include all the intervening claim limitations.

Applicant has rewritten claim 80 into base claim 65 to include all the intervening claim limitations.

Applicant has added new independent claim 110 to include all the limitations of claim 20, including its base and intervening claim limitations.

Applicant has added new independent claim 111 to include all the limitations of claim 52, including its base and intervening claim limitations.

Applicant has added new independent claim 112 to include all the limitations of claim 84, including its base and intervening claim limitations.

Request for clarification

Applicant notes that Examiner has both objected to claim 18 as dependent on a previously-rejected base claim and has rejected claim 18 under section 103 below. Although Examiner has not rejected claims 50 and 82, the limitations of claims 50 and 82 are substantially the same as claim 18, and thus, Applicants requests clarification as to the status of claims 18, 50 and 82. Specifically, Applicant requests clarification as to whether said claims would be allowable for reasons other than their dependency as currently amended.

Applicant further notes that Examiner has objected to claims 28-30, 60-62 and 92-94, wherein the limitations of each set is substantially the same. Since Examiner has also rejected claims 28-30 under section 102 below, Applicant requests clarification as to the status of claims 28-30, 60-62 and 92-94. Specifically, Applicant requests clarification as to

whether said claims would be allowable for reasons other than their dependency as currently amended.

112 Rejections

Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 15-21, 24-30, 32-39, 47-53, 56-62, 64-71, 79-85, 88-94, 96, 108 and 109, under 35 U.S.C. §112, as indefinite.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to correct the indefiniteness of the antecedent basis and has further incorporated the limitations of claims 2, 15 and 16. In incorporating claim 2 limitations into claim 1, Applicant has clarified that the collapsible container has a top, a bottom and four sides.

Applicant has amended claim 33 to correct the indefiniteness of the antecedent basis and has further incorporated the limitations of claims 34, 47 and 48. In incorporating claim 34 limitations into claim 33, Applicant has clarified that the collapsible container has a top, a bottom and four sides.

Applicant has amended claim 65 to correct the indefiniteness of the antecedent basis and has further incorporated the limitations of claims 66, 79 and 80. In incorporating claim 66 limitations into claim 65, Applicant has clarified that the collapsible container has a top, a bottom and four sides.

Applicant has amended claim 108 to correct the indefiniteness of the antecedent basis and has further incorporated the limitations of claims 2, 15 and 16.

Applicant has cancelled claims 2, 15, 16, 19, 20, 34, 47, 48, 51, 52, 66, 79, 80, 83 and 84.

102(b) Rejections

In the Office Action of November 16, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by LeFleur (U.S. Pat. No. 5,607,237).

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1, 33 and 65 are in condition for allowance and that Examiner's rejection of all claims depending therefrom is moot. Applicant further requests that all withdrawn claims depending from claims 1, 33 and 65, namely claims 8-14, 22-23, 31, 40-46, 54-55, 63, 72-78, 86-87 and 95, be reinstated.

103(a) Rejections

In the Office Action of November 16, 2005, the Examiner rejected claim 18, 50 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeFleur (U.S. Pat. No. 5,607,237).

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1, 33 and 65 are in condition for allowance and that Examiner's rejection of all claims depending therefrom is moot. Applicant further requests that all withdrawn claims depending from claims 1, 33 and 65 be reinstated.

Applicant has amended claim 108 to include the limitations of claims 2, 15 and 16. The substantive difference between claim 108 and claim 1 is the limitation of impermeability in claim 108. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 108 is in condition for allowance and that Examiner's rejection of all claims depending therefrom is moot.

New Claims

Applicant has added new independent claims 110, 111, 112 and 113. Claim 110 comprises the limitations of claims 1, 19 and 20. Claim 111 comprises the limitations of claims 1, 19 and 20. Claim 112 comprises the limitations of claims 1, 19 and 20. Claim 113 comprises the limitations of claims 2, 15 and 16 in combination with the planar top of claim 33 and the parallel top and bottom of claim 65. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 110-113 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has cancelled withdrawn claims 97-107. The above amendments are to form only, and, thus, no new matter was added. In light of the amendments to claims 1, 33,

Inglese, Pat

Appl. No. 10/722,153

Filed: November 25, 2003

Atty. Docket No. 21480-RA

Page 28 of 28

65 and 108, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-96, and 108-109 are now allowable.

Applicant further respectfully submits that new claims 110-113 are allowable.

Otherwise, should the Examiner have any questions regarding this submission, he is invited to contact the undersigned counsel at the address or telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted, this 17th day of January, 2006,



Thomas R. Williamson III, Esq.

Reg. No. 47,180

Email: twilliamson@mkiplaw.com

MYERS & KAPLAN,
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, L.L.C.
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA 30339
Phone: (770) 541-7444
Fax: (770) 541-7448